UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,945	04/19/2005	Mark H. Shipton	123458	4508
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 08/12/200 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	SPEER, TIMOTHY M		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/531,945	SHIPTON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	TIMOTHY M. SPEER	1794			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Ap	oril 2008				
	action is non-final.				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23 and 30</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-8,12-23 and 30</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-11</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.			
Attachment(s)	_				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)				

Application/Control Number: 10/531,945 Page 2

Art Unit: 1794

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claim 30 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: new claim 30 is directed to a method classified in class 427 and is drawn to a different statutory category of inventions than acted on in the previous Office Action.

2. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 30 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takabatake (USPN 3,927,223) in view of Sudhakar (USPN 5,525,211).
- 5. Takabatake teaches spinel coatings formed on metal substrates, wherein the spinels may be doped with a variety of metal oxides, such as NiO (col. 2, lines 25-29 and col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 3, for instance). Takabatake fails to teach the use of CaO, as recited in the present claims. Sudhakar teaches the functional equivalence of NiO and CaO in spinel materials (col. 4, lines 5-9, for instance). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

Application/Control Number: 10/531,945 Page 3

Art Unit: 1794

the art to employ CaO in the spinels of Takabatake, since Sudhakar teaches that CaO is functionally equivalent to the NiO disclosed by Takabatake.

- 6. It is the Examiner's position that the dopant will result in spinels having regions that vary from a stoichiometric spinel ratio, as presently claimed. Regarding the claimed physical properties, e.g., defect zones and oriented grain boundaries, the films of Takabatake are made by plasma spraying as disclosed in the subject specification and set forth in the claims, and, accordingly, are considered to meet these claimed characteristics.
- 7. In light of the above, it is the Examiner's position that the present claims are prima facie obvious in view of the applied prior art.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 04/24/08 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY M. SPEER whose telephone number is (571)272-8385. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith D. Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/531,945 Page 4

Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy M. Speer/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1794